Case 2:16-cv-05107-CMR Document 1 Filed 09/23/16 Page 1 of 12



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

MARKISHA MAJOR

16

5107

٧.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

PHILADELPHIA POLICE OFFICER DAVID MOCKUS, Badge #4750 and PHILADELPHIA POLICE OFFICER RAYMOND HALL, Badge #2920 and PHILADELPHIA POLICE OFFICER VINCENT GUARNA, Badge #9032 and

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

- 1. This is an action for money damages brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and under the common law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
- 2. This Court has jurisdiction of this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Plaintiff further invokes supplemental jurisdiction of this Court to hear and decide claims arising under state law.

PARTIES

- 3. Plaintiff is MARKISHA MAJOR, an adult individual residing at 5101 Duffield Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- 4. Defendant is **POLICE OFFICER DAVID MOCKUS**, **Badge #4750**, an adult individual employed as a police officer for the City of Philadelphia who was employed in such capacity at all times material hereto and who was among the officers who assaulted and arrested the plaintiff, Markisha Major, on September 23, 2014.
 - 5. Defendant is also POLICE OFFICER RAYMOND HALL, Badge #2920, an adult

individual employed as a police officer for the City of Philadelphia who was employed in such capacity at all times material hereto and who was among the officers who assaulted and arrested the plaintiff, Markisha Major, on September 23, 2014.

- 6. Defendant is also **POLICE OFFICER VINCENT GUARNA**, **Badge #9032**, an adult individual employed as a police officer for the City of Philadelphia who was employed in such capacity at all times material hereto and who was among the officers who assaulted and arrested the plaintiff, Markisha Major, on September 23, 2014.
- 7. Defendant is also CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, a city of the first class located in the County of Philadelphia, organized and operating pursuant to state and local laws, in its capacity as the employer of the defendant Philadelphia Police Officers, with an address of c/o City Law Department, 1515 Arch Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

FACTS

- 8. At all times material hereto, Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750; Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920; and Police Officer Vincent Guarna, Badge #9032 were police officers of the City of Philadelphia and were acting in their capacities as agents, servants, workers, and employees of this entity under its direction and control and were acting pursuant to either official policy or the custom, practice, and usage of the City of Philadelphia's Police Department.
- 9. Defendant City of Philadelphia, in this cause, acted through its agents, servants, workers, and employees, who was or were the policymakers for the City of Philadelphia and for its employees, including Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750; Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920; and Police Officer Vincent Guarna, Badge #9032, who, along with other officers, were involved in the arrest and assault and/or beating of Plaintiff Markisha Major, on or about September 23, 2014.
 - 10. On September 23, 2014 at approximately 8:03 p.m., the plaintiff, Markisha Major,

was arrested by officers of Defendant City of Philadelphia's police department including Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750 and Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920.

- 12. Upon hearing a disturbance on the front porch of Plaintiff's residence at 5101 Duffield Street in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Plaintiff came outside to determine what was occurring, at which point she encountered Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750 and Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920, who subjected Plaintiff to unreasonable, unnecessary, and excessive physical force, which included but was not limited to: slamming her body into hard surfaces, pushing and hitting.
- 13. Following the assault, Defendant Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920 arrested the plaintiff, Markisha Major, without cause or justification, the report of which arrest was written by Defendant Police Officer Vincent Guarna, Badge #9032.
- 14. As a result of the above assault, the plaintiff, Markisha Major, sustained personal injuries including but not limited to: cervical spine sprain and strain, bilateral wrist sprain and strain, lumbar spine sprain and strain, multiple leg and facial contusions, and other injuries and conditions more fully set forth in the reports and records of Plaintiff's treating physicians.
- 15. Before the plaintiff was arrested by Defendant Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920, she was subjected to unnecessary and unreasonable force and deprived of her liberty in violation of the civil rights guaranteed to her by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, the application of which force was a factual cause of the injury to the plaintiff's person.
- 16. The foregoing actions of Philadelphia Police Officers, including but not limited to Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750; Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920; and Police Officer Vincent Guarna, Badge #9032, constituted a violation of the plaintiff's constitutional right to be free from the use of excessive force and a violation of her right to be

free from summary punishment.

- 17. After the assault and battery inflicted upon her by the defendant police officers, the plaintiff suffered pain and suffering and endured humiliation and embarrassment.
- 18. As a direct and proximate result of the said acts, the plaintiff suffered injuries and damages including but not limited to the following:
 - a) violation of her constitutional right to be free from the use of excessive force;
 - b) violation of her right to be free from summary punishment;
 - c) loss of physical liberty;
 - d) physical pain and suffering;
 - e) multiple sprains, strains, and contusions;
 - f) emotional upset and trauma;
 - g) humiliation and embarrassment; and
 - h) injury to her reputation.

All entitling her to compensatory and punitive damages as set forth below.

COUNT I

42 U.S.C.§ 1983 AGAINST DEFENDANT OFFICERS

- 19. Paragraphs 1 through 18 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 20. Plaintiff Markisha Major claims damages against Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750; Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920; and Police Officer Vincent Guarna, Badge #9032, as well as other City of Philadelphia police officers involved in the arrest and beating of the plaintiff, Markisha Major, individually and in their official capacities, for the injuries and damages set forth above under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for violation of the plaintiff's constitutional rights under color of state law.

COUNT II

ASSAULT AND BATTERY AGAINST DEFENDANT OFFICERS

- 21. Paragraphs 1 through 20 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 22. Defendant Philadelphia Police Officers involved in the beating of the plaintiff, Markisha Major, including but not limited to Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750 and Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920, assaulted and battered the plaintiff prior to arresting her.
- 23. As a result of this assault and battery, the plaintiff suffered the aforesaid injuries and damages.

COUNT III

FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, 42 U.S.C, § 1983 CLAIM AGAINST DEFENDANT, CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

- 24. Paragraphs 1 through 23 are incorporated here by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 25. As a direct and proximate result of the defendants' conduct committed under color of state law, the defendants deprived the plaintiff, Markisha Major, of her rights, privileges, and immunities under the laws and Constitution of the United States, her right to be free from unreasonable and excessive force, to be free from summary punishment, to be secure in her person and property and to due process of law. As a result, the plaintiff suffered harm in violation of her rights under the law and Constitution of the United States, in particular 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 26. As a direct and proximate result of the acts of all defendants, the plaintiff sustained physical injuries.
- 27. It was the policy and/or custom of the defendant, City of Philadelphia, to tolerate, condone, and, through inaction, encourage the unconstitutional conduct of police officers

including most especially defendant City of Philadelphia police officers, including but not limited to Defendants Police Officer David Mockus, Badge #4750; Police Officer Raymond Hall, Badge #2920; and Police Officer Vincent Guarna, Badge #9032, who Defendant knew had committed similar acts of physical violence upon individuals while acting under the authority of their office and under color of state law.

- 28. The defendant, City of Philadelphia, has encouraged, tolerated, ratified, and has been deliberately indifferent to the following patterns, practices and customs and to the need for more or different training, supervision, investigation or discipline in the areas of:
 - a. the abuse of police powers, including but not limited to the use of excessive force, the use of summary punishment and deprivation of citizens' due process rights;
 - b. the failure of police officers to follow established policies and procedures regarding proper procedure for arrest;
 - c. proper procedures, in the manner in which prisoners are housed and processed so that they are not subject to physical abuse at the hands of police so that: i) employees of Defendant City of Philadelphia, including the defendant officers in this case, can be properly trained, supervised and disciplined for conduct related to the performance of their duties; ii) Defendant City of Philadelphia can properly monitor the conduct and performance of their employees to assure compliance with the laws and Constitutions of the United States and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and iii) citizens such as Plaintiffs can determine the identities of those employees who subject them to constitutional violations under such circumstances as presented herein and thereby seek vindication of their constitutional and statutory rights; and
 - d. The failure of police officers to prevent, deter, report or take action against the unlawful conduct of other officers under such circumstances as presented herein.
- 29. Defendant City of Philadelphia failed to properly sanction or discipline officers who are aware of and subsequently conceal and/or aid and abet violations of constitutional rights of citizens by other police officers, thereby causing and encouraging police, including the defendant officers in this case, to violate the rights of citizens such as the plaintiff.
 - 30. By these actions, all defendants, acting in concert and conspiracy, have deprived

the plaintiff of rights secured by the Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. §1983.

- 31. It was the policy or custom of the defendant, City of Philadelphia, to inadequately supervise and train its police officers, thereby failing to adequately discourage further constitutional violations on the part of its officers.
- 32. The defendant, City of Philadelphia, failed to properly sanction or discipline officers who are aware of and conceal and/or aid and abet violations of constitutional rights of citizens by other City of Philadelphia police officers, thereby causing and encouraging Philadelphia police officers, including the defendant officers in this case, to violate the rights of citizens such as the plaintiff.
- 33. As a result of the above described policies and customs, police officers employed by the defendant, City of Philadelphia, including but not limited to the individual defendants herein, believed their actions would not be properly monitored by supervisory officers and that misconduct would not be investigated or sanctioned but would be tolerated.
- 34. The above-described policies and customs demonstrated a deliberate indifference on the part of the policymakers of the City of Philadelphia to the constitutional rights of persons within the City of Philadelphia, and were the cause of the violations of minor plaintiff's rights as described herein.

COUNT IV

SUPPLEMENTAL STATE CLAIMS - ASSAULT AND BATTERY

- 35. Paragraphs 1 through 34 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 36. The acts and conduct of the defendant officers in this cause of action constitutes assault, battery, and intentional infliction of emotional distress under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this Court has supplemental jurisdiction to hear and

adjudicate these claims.

COUNT V

SUPPLEMENTAL STATE CLAIMS - FALSE ARREST

- 37. Paragraphs 1 through 36 are incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth at length.
- 38. The acts and conduct of the defendant officers in detaining and arresting the plaintiff constitutes a false arrest under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and this Court has supplemental jurisdiction to hear and adjudicate these claims.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiff, Markisha Major, requests that the Court:

- a) award compensatory damages to the plaintiff against the defendants jointly and severally;
- b) award exemplary or punitive damages against the defendants;
- c) award reasonable costs and attorney's fees to the plaintiff; and
- d) award such other relief as the Court may deem appropriate

JAFFE & HOUGH

TIMOTHY R. HOUGH, ESQ.

Attorney for Plaintiff

I.D. # 40898

JAFFE & HOUGH

1907 Two Penn Center Plaza

15th Street & JFK Blvd.

Philadelphia, PA 19102

(215) 564-5200

Case 2:16-cv-05107-CMR Document 1 Filed 09/23/16 Page CIVIL COVER SHEET JS 44 (Rev. 07/16) Jistance bil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the upper as required for the United States in September 1974, is required for the upper as required for the Clerk in International Property of the (a) PLAINTIFFS **DEFENDANTS** The City of Philadelphia; Phila. Police Officer David Mockus, Badge # Màrkisha Major 4750; Phila. P.O. Raymond Hall, Badge # 2920; Phila. P.O Vincent Guara, Badge # 9032. Phila. Police Corniss Richard Ross Jo County of Residence of First Listed Defendant ⁵hiladelphia County (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFI (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) CASES) IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED. (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
JAFFE & HOUGH Attorneys (If Known) 1907 Two Penn Center Plaza, 1500 JFK BLVD 215 654 5200 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant) (For Diversity Cases Only) PTF PTF DEF 1 U.S. Government DEF 0 4 0 4 □ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State \Box 1 of Business In This State ☐ 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 2 U.S. Government 5 **D** 5 4 Diversity Citizen of Another State **1** 2 (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III) of Business In Another State Defendant Citizen or Subject of a □ 3 □ 3 Foreign Nation 6 5 6 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES ☐ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 625 Drug Related Seizure ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 375 False Claims Act ☐ 120 Marine 310 Airplane 365 Personal Injury of Property 21 USC 881 ☐ 423 Withdrawal ☐ 376 Qui Tam (31 USC) ☐ 690 Other ☐ 130 Miller Act 315 Airplane Product Product Liability 28 USC 157 3729(a)) ☐ 400 State Reapportionment 140 Negotiable Instrument Liability ☐ 367 Health Care/ 150 Recovery of Overpayment □ 320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical PROPERTY RIGHTS ☐ 410 Antitrust & Enforcement of Judgmen Slander Personal Injury ☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 430 Banks and Banking 151 Medicare Act ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Product Liability ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 450 Commerce ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Liability ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal ☐ 840 Trademark ☐ 460 Deportation Student Loans ☐ 340 Marine Injury Product 470 Racketeer Influenced and (Excludes Veterans) ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability LABOR SOCIAL SECURITY Corrupt Organizations PERSONAL PROPERTY ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment Liability 710 Fair Labor Standards ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) 480 Consumer Credit ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 370 Other Fraud ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV Act ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle ☐ 720 Labor/Management ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ 190 Other Contract Product Liability ☐ 380 Other Personal Relations ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI Exchange ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability 360 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act □ 865 RSI (405(g)) ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ 385 Property Damage ☐ 751 Family and Medical 891 Agricultural Acts Injury 362 Personal Injury -Product Liability Leave Act ☐ 893 Environmental Matters Medical Malpractice ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ■ 895 Freedom of Information REAL PROPERTY PRISONER PETITIONS CIVIL RIGHTS ☐ 791 Employee Retirement FEDERAL TAX SUITS Act ☐ 210 Land Condemnation 440 Other Civil Rights Income Security Act ■ 896 Arbitration Habeas Corpus: 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff ☐ 441 Voting ☐ 220 Foreclosure 463 Alien Detainee or Defendant) ■ 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectmen 442 Employment ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate 871 IRS—Third Party 240 Torts to Land ☐ 443 Housing/ Sentence 26 USC 7609 Agency Decision 245 Tort Product Liability Accommodations ☐ 530 General ☐ 950 Constitutionality of 290 All Other Real Property ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities 535 Death Penalty IMMIGRATION State Statutes Employment Other: 462 Naturalization Application 446 Amer. w/Disabilities 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 465 Other Immigration Other 550 Civil Rights Actions ☐ 448 Education 555 Prison Condition

• '	ORIGIN	(Place an "X" in One Box Only
1	0-1-1-1	7 2 Damana J. Gram

Removed from State Court

 \square 3 Remanded from Appellate Court

IUDGE

560 Civil Detainee Conditions of Confinement

> 4 Reinstated or Reopened

Transferred from Another District (specify)

Multidistrict Litigation -Transfer

■ 8 Multidistrict Litigation -Direct File

Cite the U.S.	Civil Statute i	ınder which yo	u are filing (1	Do not cite juris	dictional statutes i	inless diversity):
42 U.S.C.	1983	•		•		

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause: Civil rights violation

VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. **COMPLAINT:** NONE

(See instructions):

DEMAND \$ 150,000.00

JURY DEMAND:

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: X Ye ☐ No

VIII.	RE	ELATED	CASE(S
	TE	ANT	

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

DOCKET NUMBER

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE

Proceeding

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGESEP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

RICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose trace calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: Markisha Major, 5001 Duffield Street, Philadelphia, PA 19124			
Address of Defendant: Law Department, 1515 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19102			
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Philadelphia, PA (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)			
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporate	/ \		
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P	. 7.1(a)) Yes No 🗹		
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ (No 🗹		
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:		
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	Date Tollimated.		
Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within	n one year previously terminated action in this court?		
	Yes□ No ☑		
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a action in this court?	prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated		
	Yes No ♥		
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any e	earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously		
terminated action in this court?	Yes No 🗸		
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civ	vil rights case filed by the same individual?		
	Yes No 🗹		
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)			
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:		
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts		
2. ☐ FELA	2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury		
3. Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. ☐ Assault, Defamation		
4. □ Antitrust	4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury		
5. Patent	5. ☐ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury		
d. Labor-Management Relations	6. ☐ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)		
7. 🗹 Civil Rights	7. Products Liability		
8 Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos		
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases		
10. ☐ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)		
11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)			
ARBITRATION CEN			
I, Timothy R. Hough, Esq. , counsel of record			
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum			
of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;			
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.			
DATE: September 23, 2016 Attorney at Law	40898 Attorney I.D.#		
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if	•		
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court			
except as noted above.			
DATE: September 23, 2016	40898 Attorney I D #		
Attorney-at-Law Attorney	Attorney I.D.#		

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

SEP 23 2016



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM P 5: 23

MARKISHA MAJOR	: :	CIVIL ACTION	USSC-ERRA			
v. PHILADELPHIA POLICE OFFICER DAVID MOCKUS, BADGE #4750. et al	: : : :	NO.	18	01	0	T
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.						
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:						
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought	under 28 U.S.C	. § 2241 through § 2	255.	()	
(b) Social Security – Cases requesti and Human Services denying pla			ary of Health	()	
(c) Arbitration - Cases required to b	be designated for	r arbitration under L	ocal Civil Rule 5	3.2. ()	
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving clain exposure to asbestos.	ms for personal	injury or property da	mage from	()	
(e) Special Management – Cases the commonly referred to as comple the court. (See reverse side of the management cases.)	x and that need	special or intense m	anagement by	(<u>)</u>	\
(f) Standard Management - Cases to	hat do not fall ir	nto any one of the otl	ner tracks.	(भ	

September 23, 2016 Date	Timothy R. Hough, Esq. Attorney-at-law	Plaintiff Major Attorney for
(215) 564-5200	(215) 563- 8729	jafhough@aol.com_
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address
(Civ. 660) 10/02		